

Authority

This action is authorized under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, §§ 201–03, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 3721–23 (1988).

Background

The National Institute of Justice is soliciting research and evaluation proposals responsive to the evaluation and research requirements related to the Violence Against Women Act—Title IV of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. Interested organizations should call the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) at 1–800–851–3420 to obtain a copy of “Solicitation for Research and Evaluation on Violence Against Women” (refer to document No. SL000124). The solicitation is available electronically via the NCJRS Bulletin Board, which can be accessed via Internet. Telnet to ncjrsbbs.aspensys.com, or gopher to ncjrs.aspensys.com 71. Those without Internet access can dial the NCJRS Bulletin Board via modem: dial 301–738–8895. Set modem at 9600 baud, 8–N–1.

Jeremy Travis,

Director, National Institute of Justice.

[FR Doc. 95–15130 Filed 6–20–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–320]

Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact Regarding the Extension of Possession-only License No. DPR–73; GPU Nuclear Corporation Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 2

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Possession-Only License No DPR–73 which allows GPU Nuclear Corporation (the licensee) to possess but not operate the permanently shut down Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2 (TMI–2). The amendment would extend the expiration date of the license from November 9, 2009, to April 19, 2014.

Description of the Proposed Action

TMI–2 has been shut down since the March 28, 1979 accident. The facility has been defueled to the extent practicable and has been partially decontaminated. It is now in a safe storage mode called Post-Defueling Monitored Storage (PDMS). The licensee intends to keep TMI–2 in PDMS until

the TMI–1 license expires on April 19, 2014, at which time the units would be decommissioned simultaneously.

Environmental Impacts

The staff evaluated the potential environmental and safety consequences of PDMS in Final Supplement 3 to the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Related to Decontamination and Disposal of Radioactive Wastes Resulting from the March 28, 1979 Accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2 (PEIS Supplement 3 or NUREG–0683 Supplement 3), dated August 1989. The staff evaluated radiological and non-radiological impacts associated with the licensee's proposal and seven staff identified alternatives. The licensee's proposal included storage of TMI–2 until the end of the TMI–1 license in the year 2014. The staff concluded that each of the alternatives (with the exception of the no-action alternative) were within applicable regulatory limits and could each be implemented without significant environmental impact. The potential health impact on both workers and the offsite public from any of the alternatives was very small. The staff concluded that none of the alternatives was obviously superior to the licensee's proposal from the perspective of environmental impacts. Although the quantitative estimates of potential impacts varied among the alternatives, the differences were not judged sufficiently large to allow for identification of an obviously superior alternative. The staff further concluded that the licensee's proposal was environmentally acceptable and would not significantly affect the quality of the human environment. The staff reviewed the conclusions of the 1989 PEIS Supplement 3 and the current TMI–2 conditions now that the facility is in long-term storage. The staff determined that the conclusions reached with respect to environmental impact associated with long-term storage of TMI–2 in the 1989 PEIS Supplement 3 are still valid.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based on the foregoing environmental assessment, the Commission has concluded that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for this proposed action.

For further details with respect to this action see the licensee's environmental evaluation dated March 11, 1987, the licensee's request for a license

amendment dated October 9, 1991, and the staff's PEIS Supplement 3 dated August 1989. These documents are available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20555 and at the Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 15th day of June 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Seymour H. Weiss,

Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate, Division of Project Support, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–15137 Filed 6–20–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 50–315]

Indiana Michigan Power Company; Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from Facility Operating License No. DPR–58, issued to Indiana Michigan Power Company, (the licensee), for operation of the D.C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, located in Berrien County, Michigan.

Environmental Assessment*Identification of the Proposed Action*

This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to address potential environmental issues related to the licensee's application of March 17, 1995. The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.1.(a), to the extent that a one-time interval extension for the Type A test (containment integrated leak rate test) by approximately 18 months from the September 1995 refueling outage to the 1997 refueling outage would be granted.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to permit the licensee to defer the Type A test from the September 1995 refueling outage to the 1997 refueling outage, thereby saving the cost of performing the test and eliminating test period from the critical path time of the outage.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed one-time exemption would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and the proposed one-time exemption would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents. The licensee has analyzed the results of previous Type A tests performed at the D.C. Cook Nuclear Plant to show adequate containment performance and will continue to be required to conduct the Type B and C local leak rate tests which historically have been shown to be the principal means of detecting containment leakage paths with the Type A tests confirming the Type B and C test results. It is also noted that the licensee would perform the visual containment inspection although it is only required by Appendix J to be conducted in conjunction with Type A tests. The NRC staff considers that these inspections, though limited in scope, provide an important added level of confidence in the continued integrity of the containment boundary. The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types or amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed

action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for D.C. Cook, Units 1 and 2, dated August 1973.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 31, 1995, the NRC staff consulted with the Michigan State official, Dennis Hahn, of the Michigan Department of Public Health, Nuclear Facilities and Environmental Monitoring, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated March 17, 1995, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Maud Preston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, Michigan 49085.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of June.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John B. Hickman,

Project Manager, Project Directorate III-1, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-15142 Filed 6-20-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 40-9022]

SCA Services Inc., Finding of No Significant Impact, and Opportunity for a Hearing

Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) related to the issuance of Source Material License No. SUC-1565. On the basis of the EA, the NRC has concluded that this licensing action would not significantly affect the environment and does not warrant the preparation of an

environmental impact statement. Accordingly, it has been determined that a Finding of No Significant Impact is appropriate.

The above document related to this proposed action are available for public inspection and copying at the NRC's Public Document Room, Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20555.

Opportunity for a Hearing

Any person whose interest may be affected by the issuance of this license may file a request for a hearing. Any request for hearing must be filed with the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, within 30 days of the publication of this **Federal Register** notice; be served on the NRC staff (Executive Director for Operations, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852) and on the applicant (SCA Services, Inc., 17250 Newburgh Rd., Livonia, MI 48152) and must comply with the requirements for requesting a hearing set forth in the Commission's regulations, 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart L, "Informal Hearing Procedures for Adjudications in Materials Licensing Proceedings."

These requirements, which the requestor must address in detail, are:

1. The interest of the requester in the proceeding;
2. How that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding, including the reasons why the requestor should be permitted a hearing;
3. The requestor's areas of concern about the licensing activity that is the subject matter of the proceeding; and
4. The circumstances establishing that the request for hearing is timely, that is, filed within 30 days of the date of this notice.

In addressing how the requestor's interest may be affected by the proceeding, the request should describe the nature of the requestor's right under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to be made a party to the proceeding; the nature and extent of the requestor's property, financial, or other (i.e., health, safety, environmental) interest in the proceeding; and the possible effect of any order that may be entered in the proceeding upon the requestor's interest.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, the 12th day of June 1995.